

Date: Fri, 11 Nov 94 04:30:15 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #526
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 11 Nov 94 Volume 94 : Issue 526

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 10 Nov 1994 12:46:49 +1100
From: dave@eram.esi.com.au (Dave Horsfall)

References<38rm5k\$3hb@crcnis1.unl.edu> <1994Nov2.022732.8616@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<CytDzo.9Bp@news.hawaii.edu>
Subject: Re: Speed limits (was: Kindness and ham radio)

In article <CytDzo.9Bp@news.hawaii.edu>,
 jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:

| Trucks are dangerously top-heavy (especially those with phased CB
| antennas on the mirrors), [...]

Unless your definition of the word "truck" differs from mine (not the
first time the same word means different things in USA and AUS) I can't
see how a few feet on antennae on the mirrors will make a difference.

| >Cover the speedometer, and people will drive at the natural speed
| >of the road.
|
| Then count the bodies along the curves from those who have spun out.

Darwin would have called this "natural selection." You shouldn't

need a sign to tell you to slow down for a curve.

--

Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) | dave@esi.com.au | VK2KFU @ VK2AAB.NSW.AUS.OC | PGP 2.6
Opinions expressed are mine. | E7 FE 97 88 E5 02 3C AE 9C 8C 54 5B 9A D4 A0 CD

Date: 10 Nov 1994 20:31:43 GMT
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<1994Nov8.181422.22173@clark.dgim.doc.ca> <Cz125F.9Ao@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<1994Nov10.153606.21890@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject: Re: No code Techs and CW...

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: In article <Cz125F.9Ao@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:
: >
: >The problem with this line of reasoning is that CW is still in large
: >use today. According to my counts (my QTH is in the Central Pacific)
: >nearly 50% of the HF comms are conducted via CW. That's a darn good
: >reason for still requiring a knowledge of code to get an HF license.

: No it is not. Even if we accept your survey as being true, and the
: ARRL survey disagrees, then all your survey shows is that it could
: be *useful* to know Morse Code for HF operations if your goal was to
: work every other station in the world. It does not show that it is
: *necessary* to know Morse Code if your goal is something else. The
: ARRL survey showed that 78% of amateurs use SSB, and some 20% use
: machine digital modes, with slow scan and fax operations trailing
: the pack. This says you can work the majority of amateurs on HF
: without Morse knowledge. In fact, because the ARRL survey showed
: that 62% of amateurs who've passed a code test *never use code*,
: you'd *have* to use some mode other than Morse if you wanted to
: work every station in the world. Of course you can learn Morse
: *for its own sake* if you wish, just as you would any other specialty
: mode, and then work some other stations who don't have anything else,
: but it's *not necessary* for you to do so to effectively utilize the
: HF bands. That is, it would not be necessary except for the forced
: government testing requirement.

: Gary

Here we go again. I presume the ARRL survey sampled United States
amateurs. You are reminded that the HF bands are international in
scope, and that one of the reasons Amateur Radio exists is to
further international goodwill. Morse is still a very heavily used
mode, internationally, and, whether you accept it (or understand it)

or not, it does facilitate communication among people who do not share spoken fluency in a common language. That's the way it has worked for decades, and that's the way it still works today.

Amateur radio is more than data transfer rates, more than technology, and even more than the sum of the regulations which authorize its existence. You can cite part 97 until you are blue in the face, and tout the praises of high speed data transfer and spread spectrum all you want. Amateur radio is much more than that. And while you are quick to belittle tradition, it is tradition which distinguishes hams from other "communicators". When you succeed in distilling the tradition out of Amateur Radio, Amateur Radio will cease to exist.

Greg
WB0RTK

Date: Thu, 10 Nov 1994 15:36:06 GMT
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<Pine.3.87.9411031218.A84961-01000000@fep01.rfc.comm.harris.com>
<1994Nov8.181422.22173@clark.dgim.doc.ca>, <Cz125F.9Ao@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject: Re: No code Techs and CW...

In article <Cz125F.9Ao@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:
>

>The problem with this line of reasoning is that CW is still in large
>use today. According to my counts (my QTH is in the Central Pacific)
>nearly 50% of the HF comms are conducted via CW. That's a darn good
>reason for still requiring a knowledge of code to get an HF license.

No it is not. Even if we accept your survey as being true, and the ARRL survey disagrees, then all your survey shows is that it could be **useful** to know Morse Code for HF operations if your goal was to work every other station in the world. It does not show that it is **necessary** to know Morse Code if your goal is something else. The ARRL survey showed that 78% of amateurs use SSB, and some 20% use machine digital modes, with slow scan and fax operations trailing the pack. This says you can work the majority of amateurs on HF without Morse knowledge. In fact, because the ARRL survey showed that 62% of amateurs who've passed a code test **never use code**, you'd **have** to use some mode other than Morse if you wanted to work every station in the world. Of course you can learn Morse **for its own sake** if you wish, just as you would any other specialty mode, and then work some other stations who don't have anything else, but it's **not necessary** for you to do so to effectively utilize the

HF bands. That is, it would not be necessary except for the forced government testing requirement.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #526
